

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. The foregoing amendments are responsive to the January 2, 2007 Final Office Action. Applicants respectfully request entry of the requested amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the following comments.

Response to the Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The rejection asserts that Ogura and Naughton allegedly teach each element of the claims. Claims 1-5, 7-20, 22-35, and 37-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogura et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,189,056 (hereinafter Ogura), in view of Naughton et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,020,881 (hereinafter Naughton). The rejection asserts that Ogura allegedly teaches each element of the claims except for “providing a user interface for the application only on the host device, and executing the application on the communication device”, which is allegedly taught by Naughton.

In the office action, in response to the previously submitted arguments, it is noted that the Examiner could not find the teaching of *emulating* a user interface to mean the graphics area on the host device “may correspond in appearance to the graphics area of a particular communication device,” and “the user input area may correspond generally to the keypad of a communications device” in paragraphs [0032] and [0033] of the application. Thus, the term “emulating” was treated in its broadest possible context, and the rejection was maintained. However, these concepts are taught in the present application, and the paragraphs [0032] and [0033] cited were taken from the published application, which has different paragraph numbering than the originally submitted application. In the originally submitted application, these concepts are found in paragraphs [0028] and [0029]. Thus, Applicants maintain their

previous arguments overcome the cited references, and will resubmit these comments here with the corrected paragraph numbering.

The present claims are directed toward *emulating* the user interface and display of a communication device executing an application. For example, Claim 1 includes the language:

loading the application on the communication device; emulating a user interface for said application on said host device; and executing said application only on said communication device.

Similar language is in all the independent claims. Thus, in the present claims, *emulating* a user interface means the graphics area on the host device “may correspond in appearance to the graphics area of a particular communication device,” and “the user input area may correspond generally to the keypad of a communications device” as described in [0028] and [0029] (respectively) of the application. The goal is to emulate or mimic the actual display and input functionality of a communications device on the host device.

None of the cited art teaches or suggests emulating the actual, real-world user interface of a second device. Naughton teaches away from this concept as the remote objects push an “ideal graphical interface for controlling remote objects,” at col. 24, lines 28-29. In contrast, the present claims emphasize that the user is presented with an emulated user interface that closely approximates if not perfectly replicates the actual user interface of the communication device. The present claims teach a system where the user has the experience of actually using the device firsthand. On the other hand, Naughton teaches an “ideal” user interface, which precludes the user from experiencing the actual user interface on the device.

Naughton also teaches that interaction should not vary from device, which further teaches away from the present claims. In Naughton at col. 25, lines 14-18, the user is presented with the same “ideal” user interface if they are controlling either a simple or intelligent remote device. In contrast, the user interface presented in the current claims varies from device to device since

actual user interface of the device is emulated. For example, if Device A has a display resolution of 800x600 and Device B has a 640x480 display resolution, then the host device could emulate two unique resolutions for each device respectively. Under Naughton, the host device would display the same “ideal” user interface for both Device A and Device B.

In view of the foregoing distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 16, 31, and 46 are patentably distinguished over the cited art. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 16, 31, and 46 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 1, 16, 31, and 46.

Claims 2-5, 7-15, 17-20, 22-30, 32-35, 37-45, and 47-59 depend either directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims. Each dependent claim further defines the independent claim from which it depends. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding Claims 1, 16, 31, and 46, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-5, 7-15, 17-20, 22-30, 32-35, 37-45, and 47-59 are likewise in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request allowance of dependent Claims 2-5, 7-15, 17-20, 22-30, 32-35, 37-45, and 47-59.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated April 22, 2007

By: /James T. Hagler/  
James T. Hagler  
Reg. No. 40,631  
(858) 651-0266

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
Attn: Patent Department  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121-1714  
Telephone: (858) 658-5787  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502